



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/588,213	08/02/2006	Oral Aydin	293602US0PCT	6595
22850 7590 04/15/2010 OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			EXAMINER ZHAO, XIAO SI	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1714	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/15/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com



Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

wk

APR 15 2010

Mailed:

In re application of

Aydin et al.

Serial No. 10/588,213

Filed: August 2, 2006

For: Method And Device For The Application Of At Least
Two Chemically Different Flowing Media

:
:
: DECISION ON
: PETITION

This is a response to Applicants Petition To Enter Amendment filed January 4, 2010.

Applicants filed the Amendment in reply to the Final Rejection of September 2, 2009. The Amendment sought to incorporate the subject matter of Claim 13 into independent Claim 12. Claims 14-24 are the remaining dependent claims and now would have the limitation of previous claim 13

The Examiner refused entry in that the amendment raised new issues which would require further consideration and/or search. Applicant asserts that the Amendment would not involve significant additional consideration or search. Applicant further asserts that denial of the amendment appears to be inconsistent with the Office's goal of reducing the need for RCE's.

Once a final rejection that is not premature has been entered in an application, Applicants no longer have any right to unrestricted further prosecution. This does not mean that no further amendment or argument will be considered. Any amendment that will place the application either in condition for allowance or in better form for appeal may be entered. An amendment touching the merits of the application may be admitted upon a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the amendment is necessary and was not earlier presented.

Claim 13, which depends from claim 12, had the additional limitation of "wherein *the at least two chemically different flowable media are aqueous solutions of polymers, dispersions or combinations thereof which functions as adhesives and coating materials*". The Examiner rejected claims 12-13, 15-17 and 20 under 35 USC 102(b). Claims 14, 18, 19, 21-24 were rejected under 35 USC 103. A review of the record does not indicate that amendment entry would have placed the application in condition for allowance nor in better form for appeal. Applicants' remarks accompanying the amendment did not demonstrate a showing of good and sufficient reasons as to why the amendment was necessary and was not earlier presented.

Serial Number: 10/588,213

DECISION

The Petition is **DENIED**.

/JACQUELINE STONE/

Jacqueline M. Stone, Director
Technology Center 1700
Chemical and Materials Engineering

Harris A. Pitlick
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA VA 22314